



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/912,947	07/25/2001	Bjorn Dahlback	INL-036DV	7730
21323 75	590 03/29/2005		EXAMINER	
TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP			WHISENANT, ETHAN C	
HIGH STREET	TOWER			
125 HIGH STR	EET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA	02110		1634	
			DATE MAILED: 02/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summany	09/912,947	DAHLBACK, BJO	RN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ethan Whisenant, Pl		
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperent of the second for Reply	∍ars on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence ad	dress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, within the statutory minimur ill apply and will expire SIX (cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed m of thirty (30) days will be considered timel (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 De	cember 2004.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for forma	l matters, prosecution as to the	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 193	5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 46,49 and 53-63 is/are pending in the	application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	• •	on.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>46,49 and 53-63</u> is/are rejected.	•		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requireme	nt.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ed to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the c	•		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction			FR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the att	ached Office Action or form PT	O-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	, : •		
<u>-</u>			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	pnonty under 35, U.	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents	: . hava haan raasiya		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priori		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Stage
application from the International Bureau	<u>•</u>		Clage
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of			
	t		
	1		
Attachment(s)	<u> </u>		
1)		rview Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date	
2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Noti	ice of Informal Patent Application (PTC) - 152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Oth	er:	

Application/Control Number: 09/912,947

Page 2

Art Unit: 1634

Non-Final Rejection

- 1. The applicant's Response (filed 08 DEC 04) has been entered. Following the entry of the claim amendments Claim(s) 1-45, 49, 53-63 is/are pending. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous office action are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either newly applied or reiterated. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.
- 2. Please note that this application has been transferred to a different examiner within Art Unit 1634. See the closing pagragraph of this action for details.

PRIORITY

3. The applicant's Supplemental ADS have been entered and the applicant's claim(s) to foreign and/or domestic priority is confirmed.

SPECIFICATION

4. The specification has been amended as directed.

35 USC § 112- 2ND PARAGRAPH

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

CLAIM REJECTIONS under 35 USC § 112- 2ND PARAGRAPH

Claim(s) 54-63 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 54 is indefinite because the phrase "the Factor V gene locus" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Application/Control Number: 09/912,947

Art Unit: 1634

35 USC § 112 - 1ST PARAGRAPH

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

CLAIM REJECTIONS under 35 USC § 112- 1st PARAGRAPH

8. Claim(s) 46, 49 and 53-63 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims without undue experimentation.

The reasoning for the enablement rejection has been presented in earlier office actions.

Response to applicant's Amendment and/or Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph rejections have been fully and carefully considered, however, are deemed not to be persuasive. The applicant again traverses the enablement rejection.

In response to the applicant applicant arguments. The examiner respectfully asserts that the applicant has not conclusively shown that a mutated Factor V gene is: the cause of an increased risk of developing thrombosis in an individual / associated with APC-resistance. The evidence presented simply indicate that the Factor V gene is most likely involved but does not provide conclusive evidence of Factor V gene involvement. Although we now know that the applicant was correct in asserting that a mutation in the Factor V gene is the cause of APC-resistance, see Bertina et al. [US 6,518,016 (2003)], at the time of the applicant's disclosure this was not know. It is possible that the genetic defect leading to APC-resistance was the result of a defect in some other unknown gene physically close to the Factor V gene. Without showing the exact defect leading to APC-resistance the disclosure simply leads to additional experimentation in order to discover ther true defect leading to APC-resistance. Accordingly, the examiner continues to assert that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims without undue experimentation. As regards the applicants position that the examiner should not use post-filing date references to demonstrate that the patent is non-enabling." The MPEP does provide for exceptions to that "rule". "Exceptions to this rule could occur if a later-dated reference

Art Unit: 1634

provides evidence of what one skilled in the art would have known on or before the effective filing date of the patent application. In re Hogan, 559 F.2d 595, 605, 194 USPQ 527, 537 (CCPA 1977). If individuals of skill in the art state that a particular invention is not possible years after the filing date, that would be evidence that the disclosed invention was not possible at the time of filing and should be considered. In In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513-14 (Fed. Cir. 1993) an article published 5 years after the filing date of the application adequately supported the examiner's position that the physiological activity of certain viruses was sufficiently unpredictable so that a person skilled in the art would not have believed that the success with one virus and one animal could be extrapolated successfully to all viruses with all living organisms. Claims not directed to the specific virus and the specific animal were held nonenabled." See MPEP 2164.05(a).

CONCLUSION

- 10. Claim(s) 46, 49, 53-63 is/are rejected and/or objected to for the reason(s) set forth above.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0754. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30AM -5:30PM EST or any time via voice mail. If repeated attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached at (571) 272-0745.

The fax number for this Examiner is (571) 273-0754. Before faxing any papers please inform the examiner to avoid lost papers. Please note that the faxing of papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

ETHAN WHISENANT PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1634